DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 327 512 SP 032 826

AUTHOR George, Thomas A.; And Others
TITLE The Relationship between Teacher Education Admission Interviewer Ratings and Subsequent Performance Variables.
PUB DATE 14 Nov 90
NOTE 33p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, November 14-16, 1990). Student teacher evaluation forms may not reproduce well due to small, filled print.
PUB TYPE -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Standards; *Admission Criteria; Comparative Analysis; Elementary Education; Higher Education; *Interviews; Preservice Teacher Education; *Student Characteristics; *Teacher Education Programs

ABSTRACT

Acute resource limitations and demands for better prepared teachers have resulted in the imposition of enrollment caps on many U.S. teacher preparation programs. The subjects of this study included students who were selected to enter the elementary education program and who eventually enrolled in student teaching (N=93). Spearman correlations were computed to determine the relationship of admission boards interview ratings and subsequent performance variables. The results support the need to maintain admission boards which include elementary and university faculty, school teachers, and advanced students, since each interviewer type appears to focus on different student attributes, such as academic accomplishments, professional promise, etc. Such boards select better students because of the variety of rater types constituting each admission board. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED327512

The Relationship Between Teacher Education Admission Interviewer Ratings and Subsequent Performance Variables

Thomas A. George

Judith A. Boser

Saundra L. Daigle

University of Tennessee

Brenda A. Stevens

Kearney State University

Mid-South Educational Research Association

1990 Annual Meeting

New Orleans, Louisiana

November 14, 1990

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

T. W. George

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Running Head: INTERVIEWER RATINGS AND SUBSEQUENT PERFORMANCE

SP032826

Abstract

Acute resource limitations and demands for better prepared teachers have resulted in the imposition of enrollment caps on many of our nation's teacher preparation programs. The subjects of this study included students who were selected to enter the elementary education program and who eventually enrolled in student teaching. Spearman correlations were computed to determine the relationship of admission board interview ratings and subsequent performance variables. The results support the need to maintain admission boards which include elementary and university faculty, school teachers, and advanced students, since each interviewer type appears to focus on different student attributes.

The Relationship Between Teacher Education Admission Interviewer Ratings and Subsequent Performance Variables

Throughout the nation demands for increased rigor in the selection of preservice teacher education students have been rampant (Cruickshank & Cruz, 1989; Goldman & Barron, 1990; Holmes Group, 1986). As a result, the entry level minimum grade point average has been raised to 2.5 by the accrediting body for teacher education (i.e., National Association of Colleges for Teacher Education) and passing scores on standardized basic skills tests are now required by institutions in many states (Demetrulias, Chiodo, & Diekman, 1990; Tate, 1988; Watts, 1980). Furthermore, a growing number of institutions are requiring teacher education applicants to submit to an interview as a part of the selection process (Benner, George, & Cagle, 1987).

At the University of Tennessee, Knoxville (UTK), basic skills testing was imposed in 1979 and the minimum grade point average was increased from 2.2 to 2.5 in 1982. Beginning in 1985, teacher education applicants, like Law and Medical School applicants, were asked to interview before a board of admission upon successful attainment of other admission criteria.

Concurrent with the public outcry for strengthened admission standards was a call for improved teacher preparation programs. As a result, some institutions have responded by increasing the clinical nature of such programs. Some institutions began limiting enrollment to certain oversubscribed programs so as to permit faculty to work more closely with students both on campus and in the field. Enrollment limitations have been viewed often as a necessary step to program improvement in fiscal environments which prohibit the employment of additional faculty (Freeman, Martin, Brousseau, & West, 1989). In 1983, the faculty at UTK, while in the midst of formulating its reform package was asked to determine the appropriate number of students which should be admitted to each of its preservice teacher education fields. As those reforms were fleshed-out and implementation began, the elementary education faculty in 1986 began limiting preservice enrollment to 75 new students per year. (This particular enrollment cap represented a reduction of approximately 40% of the number of students admitted to elementary education in 1985.) Three years later this cap was adjusted upward to the current 100 students per year.

In strengthening admission requirements and setting enrollment caps, denial rates of students seeking admission to elementary education have ranged from a high of approximately 30% during the period of 1986-88 to a low of near 15% in 1989 when the enrollment cap was raised. With such bold changes have come increased demands for accountability in student selection procedures, as well as in program effectiveness. The purpose of this investigation is to examine the relationship between applicant interview ratings and the subsequent performance of those students who were selected to enter the elementary education program.

Method

Subjects

Potential subjects were derived from the 273 elementary education students who were admitted to the Elementary Education initial licensure program during the period Spring 1987 - Spring 1989. Complete data were available on 93 students.

Data Sources

Data were collected on each subject's admission interview ratings, student teaching evaluations, final cumulative grade point average (GPA), and performances

on NTE Core Battery and Specialty Area Tests. The interview rating form and student teacher evaluation forms are available in Appendix A and B, respectively.

Admission interview ratings

Upon completing a minimum 45 semester hours, attainment of at least a 2.5 GPA (4-point scale), and earning passing scores on the Pre-Professional Skills Test (Reading = 7th percentile, Mathematics = 11th percentile, and Writing = 16th percentile), applicants for admission to the elementary education preservice program were interviewed by an admissions panel (i.e., Board of Admission). Panels consisted of a practicing elementary school teacher, an advanced elementary education student, a university professor, and a College of Education (COE) elementary education professor. Admission interviews, which are scheduled in the fall and spring, are approximately 25 minutes in length. Each panel member independently rated each interviewee on six variables, recorded a composite score (i.e., based on the variables), and made a recommendation of "should admit", "should not admit" or "undecided". Those six variables are the following:

1. leadership potential
2. professionalism

3. teaching potential
4. written communication
5. oral communication
6. poise/confidence/appearance

Overall interview rating (i.e., derived from all panel members' composite interview scores), GPA, and Pre-Professional Skills Tests scores (i.e., Reading, Writing, and Mathematics) were given equal weight in determining an applicant's admission priority. Applicants receiving two or more recommendations of "should not admit" from board members were denied admission even when such applicants' GPAs and test scores offset the effects of their low overall interview rating.

Admission to the elementary education program is granted to the 75 - 100 applicants per year with the highest admission priorities. Applicants who are unsuccessful in gaining admission are permitted to interview the following semester and as often as desired, thereafter. Unsuccessful applicants are encouraged to discuss the status of their application with the elementary education coordinator of admissions. Some unsuccessful applicants are encouraged to interview later, while others are advised

to seek other majors.

Cronbach's Alpha was used to estimate the reliability (i.e., internal consistency) of the interviewer ratings for each of the four types of panel members. The following coefficients were derived: COE faculty = .89; university faculty = .88; school teacher = .88; advanced student = .92. Based on these results, a decision was made to collapse each interviewer's ratings into a single score.

Student Teaching Ratings

Each student teacher was evaluated independently by a COE supervisor and a cooperating teacher, using the same student teaching evaluation form. The evaluation form was revised in Fall 1989, and, as a result, 49 students were rated using the original form and 44 students were rated using the revised form. Both forms appear in Appendix B. Cronbach's Alpha was used to estimate internal reliability for both evaluation forms for cooperating teachers and for COE supervisors (see Table 1).

Insert Table 1 about here

Based on the Cronbach Alpha results, it was

decided that the scales contained within each of the instruments could be collapsed, for each form and for both evaluators. This resulted in a composite score for COE supervisors using the original form, a composite score for cooperating teachers using the original form, a composite score for COE supervisors using the revised form, and a composite score for cooperating teachers using the revised form.

Analyses

Spearman correlation coefficients were computed to examine the relationships between the interviewer rating and each of the following variables: cumulative GPA, NTE Core Battery and Specialty Area scores, cooperating teacher and COE supervisor student teaching ratings. Comparisons of rankings of student teaching ratings with rankings of interview ratings were computed separately according to the particular rating form in use at the time student teaching was completed. Coefficients were computed for each interviewer type (i.e., advanced student, school teacher, university faculty, and elementary education faculty).

Results

Student Teaching Ratings Comparisons

Original student teaching rating form. Virtually,

no relationship appeared to exist between any of the comparisons involving interview and student teaching ratings, using the original student teaching rating form. Correlation coefficients ranged from r = -.03 to r = .21. Complete data appear in Table 2.

-sert Table 2 about here

Revised student teaching rating form. Stronger correlations were found for all comparisons of interviewer ratings and student teacher ratings using the revised evaluation form. The strongest correlations between ratings of students' interviews and student teaching performance involved the ratings of the university faculty and cooperating teachers, r = .56. A correlation of similar, but somewhat less, strength was found between the interview ratings of advanced students and cooperating teachers' ratings of student teaching, r = .49. The weakest correlation noted was between university faculty interview ratings and COE supervisors' ratings of student teaching, r = .02. The remaining correlations appear in Table 2.

NTE Communication Skills Test Comparisons

The correlations between interviewer ratings and

performance on the Communication Skills test ranged from r = .04 to r = .28. The strongest correlation found was that involving the university faculty interviewer ratings, r = .28; these were followed closely by the interview ratings of the COE faculty, r = .27. The weakest correlation noted between performance on the Communication Skills test and interview ratings was that involving the advanced students' interview ratings, r = .04. Complete data appear in Table 3.

Insert Table 3 about here

NTE General Knowledge Test Comparisons

Correlations between interviewer ratings and performance on the General Knowledge test ranged from r = .05 to r = .27. The strongest correlation found was that involving the university faculty interview ratings, r = .27. The weakest correlation involved General Knowledge test performance and the interview ratings of the advanced students, r = .05.

NTE Professional Knowledge Test Comparisons

Correlations between interviewer ratings and performance on the Professional Knowledge test ranged

from r = .25 to r = .36. The strongest correlation found was that involving the COE faculty interview ratings and test performance, r = .36; this was followed closely by the correlation of university faculty interview ratings and test performance, r = .35. The weakest correlation in this series of comparisons involved the interview ratings of advanced students, r = .25.

NTE Specialty Area Test Comparison

Correlations between interview ratings and performance on the NTE Specialty Test in Elementary Education ranged from r = .18 to r = .39. The strongest correlation obtained was that involving the COE faculty ratings and Specialty test performance, r = .39. The weakest correlation involved the interview ratings of the advanced student, r = .18.

Cumulative GPA Data

Correlations between students' interview ratings and subsequent final undergraduate cumulative GPAs ranged from r = .24 to r = .35. The strongest correlation found was between school teacher interview ratings and GPAs, r = .35. The weakest correlation found involved university faculty interview ratings and GPAs, r = .24. Complete data appear in Table 4.

Insert Table 4 about here

Discussion

UTK's revised student teaching rating form is yielding much stronger correlation coefficients than its predecessor form, particularly for those comparisons involving cooperating teacher ratings. Though stronger with the revised form, correlations involving COE supervisors are still markedly weaker than those involving cooperating teachers. Interestingly, university faculty interview ratings provided the strongest correlation with cooperating teacher ratings, followed by advanced student ratings. Surprisingly, the ratings of school teachers and elementary faculty produced the weakest and next to the weakest correlations, respectively, with cooperating teacher ratings.

In all comparisons involving interviewer ratings and NTE test performance, either elementary education faculty or university faculty correlations were strongest or next strongest. Correlations involving the General Knowledge and Communication Skills tests were strongest for university faculty, while

comparisons with the Professional Knowledge and Specialty Area tests were strongest for elementary education faculty. The ratings of advanced students were clearly the weakest across all comparisons with NTE performance. Considering all raters, comparisons involving Professional Knowledge and the Specialty Area tests yielded the strongest coefficients, whereas the comparisons involving General Knowledge and Communication Skills produced the weakest correlations.

Among the various comparisons, none produced coefficients as similar to one another as those involving interview ratings and GPA. All correlations were positive, with the ratings of school teachers being the strongest and university faculty being the weakest.

In conclusion, it appears that raters focus on somewhat different applicant attributes (e.g., academic accomplishments, professional promise, etc.) and as a group actually select better students than would be possible if it were not for the variety of rater types constituting each admission board.

Limitations of Study

1. The findings of this investigation apply only to UTK's Board of Admission in Elementary Education and

are not to be generalized to any other board of admission at UTK or elsewhere.

2. Since more than one group of four raters was necessary to interview the large number of elementary education applicants, differences between groups may actually account for some part of the findings.

3. Evaluation by nature is a subjective process and, therefore, the findings of this study, which involve judgments in student selection and in teaching performance, are limited in their accuracy.

4. The findings are limited by virtue of lack of independence of ratings, since it was possible for an elementary education faculty or school teacher to have been first involved with a student during the selection process and then later to have been involved with that same student during student teaching.

5. Finally, the findings are limited due to the design of this study which includes only successful students, (i.e., ones who gained entry into elementary education and who then advanced to the point of student teaching).

References

Benner, S., George, T., and Cagle., L. (1987). Admission boards: The contribution of professional judgment to the admission process. Journal of Teacher Education, 38 (2), 7-11.

Cruickshank, D.R. & Cruz, J. Jr. (1989). Trends in teacher preparation. Journal of Teacher Education, 40 (3), 49-56.

Demetrulias, D.M., Chiodo, J.J., and Diekman, J.E. (1990). Differential admission requirements and student achievement in teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 41 (2), 66-72.

Freeman, D.R., Martin, R.J., Brousseau, B.A., and West, B.B. (1989). Do higher program admission standards alter profiles of entering teacher candidates? Journal of Teacher Education, 40 (3), 33-41.

Goldman, E., & Barron, L. (1990). Using hypermedia to improve the preparation of elementary teachers. Journal of Teacher Education, 41 (3), 21-31.

Holmes Group. (1986). Tomorrow's teachers: A report of the Holmes Group. East Lansing, MI: Author.

Tate, P.A. (1988). Whale or shark? A description of state policy domains for teacher education.

Journal of Teacher Education, 39 (6), 21-16.

Watts, D. (1980). Admissions standards for teacher preparatory programs: Time for a change. Phi Delta Kappan, 62 (2), 120-22.

Table 1

Cronbach's Alpha Coefficients for Student Teaching Evaluation Forms

Rater	Original Form	Revised Form
COE Supervisor	.77	.85
Cooperating Teacher	.93	.73

Table 2

Correlations of Interview and Student Teaching Ratings

Interview Ratings		Student Teaching Evaluation Form: Original		Student Teaching Evaluation Form: Revised	
		COE Supervisor	Cooperating Teacher	COE Supervisor	Cooperating Teacher
Elem.Fac.	r	.19	.21	.21	.35
	N	49	49	44	44
Univ.Fac.	r	-.02	-.10	.02	.56
	N	36	36	23	23
Sch.Teach	r	-.03	.17	.08	.31
	N	48	48	42	42
Adv. St.	r	.10	.18	.12	.49
	N	45	45	41	41

Table 3

Correlations of Interview Ratings and Performance on the NTE: Core Battery Tests and Specialty Area Test

Interviewer	Communication Skills	General Knowledge	Professional Knowledge	Specialty Area Test
El. Ed. Fac. N = 93	.27	.18	.36	.39
Univ. Fac. N = 59	.28	.27	.35	.33
Sch. Teach N = 90	.17	.18	.27	.30
Adv. Stud. N = 86	.04	.05	.25	.18

Table 4
Correlations of Interview Ratings and Final Undergraduate Cumulative GPA

Interviewer	GPA
El. Ed. Faculty N = 93	.27
Univ. Faculty N = 59	.24
Sch. Teacher N = 90	.35
Adv. Student N = 86	.27

APPENDIX A

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE, KNOXVILLE
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
ADMISSION TO TEACHER EDUCATION
INTERVIEW RATING

Date _____

Applicant's Name _____

Telephone _____

Social Security Number _____

Advisor's Name _____

Admissions Board Member
--- Elementary Faculty
--- University Faculty
--- School Teacher
--- Advanced Student

1. Leadership Potential (Initiative, Ability to motivate Goal directedness, Assertiveness)	1 2 3 4 5 /---------/---------/---------/---------/ Unacceptable Acceptable Highly Desirable	
2. Professionalism (Interest in teaching, Motivation)	1 2 3 4 5 /---------/---------/--------- ---------/ Unacceptable Acceptable Highly Desirable	
3. Teaching Potential Abilities (Organization, Sensitivity, Awareness of individuals, Ability to motivate, Social consciousness)	1 2 3 4 5 /---------/---------/---------/---------/ Unacceptable Acceptable Highly Desirable	
4. Written Communication (Expression and mechanics	1 2 3 4 5 /---------/---------/---------/---------/ Unacceptable Acceptable Highly Desirable	
5. Oral Communication (Expression and mechanics	1 2 3 4 5 /---------/---------/---------/---------/ Unacceptable Acceptable Highly Desirable	
6. Poise/Confidence/Appearance	1 2 3 4 5 /---------/---------/---------/---------/ Unacceptable Acceptable Highly Desirable	

Comments (Please make if average rating is below 3.0 or if recommendation is not to admit)

Overall Admissions Recommendations	Should Admit	Should Not Admit	Undecided
	------	------	------

Appendix B

Original: Used Fall 1987-Spring 1989

STUDENT TEACHER FINAL EVALUATION FORM

College of Education

The University of Tennessee

Name of Student Teacher _____ Name of Cooperating Teacher _____

Last First Middle Soc. Sec. No.

Personal

A. Self Confidence	___1. Shows little or no self confidence	___2. Shows some self confidence	___3. Is generally self confident	___4. Is self confident in all situations
B. Critical Feedback	___1. Ignores or rejects criticism	___2. Accepts criticism, does not change behavior	___3. Accepts criticism, modifies behavior	___4. Solicits criticism, modifies behavior
C. Enthusiasm	___1. Shows little or no enthusiasm	___2. Is sometimes enthusiastic	___3. Is consistently enthusiastic	___4. Generates enthusiasm in others (students/peers)
D. Involvement	___1. Ignores requests for involvement	___2. Accepts requests for involvement, does less than what was asked	___3. Accepts requests for involvement, fulfills requests	___4. Suggests involvement, fulfills plans
E. Verbal Communication	___1. Frequently demonstrates incorrect usage	___2. Occasionally demonstrates incorrect usage	___3. Demonstrates correct usage	___4. Has exceptional skill in usage
F. Written Communication	___1. Frequently demonstrates incorrect usage	___2. Occasionally demonstrates incorrect usage	___3. Demonstrates correct usage	___4. Has exceptional skill in usage

Professional

G. Student Relationships	___1. Is unresponsive to needs of students	___2. Is intermittently sensitive to needs of students	___3. Demonstrates sensitivity to needs of students	___4. Willingly provides extra effort to meet students' needs
H. Peer Relationships	___1. Shows little or no interest in interacting with peers	___2. Intermittently shows interest in activities of peers	___3. Works well with peers	___4. Works hard to promote good working relationships with peers
I. Self-Evaluation	___1. Seldom evaluates performance or behavior	___2. Evaluates performance or behavior when requested to do so	___3. Initiates self-evaluation	___4. Offers insightful suggestions after self evaluation

J. Ethical Behavior	___1. Occasionally shows unethical behavior	___2. Must be reminded to be ethical	___3. Demonstrates ethical behavior	___4. Never demonstrates unethical behavior
K. School-related, Non-classroom Responsibilities	___1. Does not assume out-of-class responsibilities	___2. Intermittently assumes out-of-class responsibilities	___3. Performs out-of-class responsibilities for smooth operation of the school	___4. Is self-motivated; assumes extra responsibilities willingly

Instruction

L. Preparation	___1. Does not prepare for classroom instruction	___2. Sometimes prepares for classroom instruction	___3. Consistently prepares for classroom instruction	___4. Displays evidence of superior preparation for instruction
M. Subject Matter Preparation	___1. Does not know content	___2. Is well prepared in some areas, inadequate in others (in content area)	___3. Exhibits broad subject matter preparation	___4. Expands student learning from that presented in textbooks
N. Explanation of Instruction to Students	___1. Frequently fails to communicate effectively with students	___2. Fails to communicate with some students	___3. Communicates effectively with students	___4. Always communicates effectively during instruction
O. Teaching Techniques	___1. Demonstrates little variety in teaching strategies which are effective	___2. Intermittently uses variety of teaching strategies which are effective	___3. Regularly uses a variety of teaching strategies which are effective	___4. Develops teaching strategies to meet individual needs of students
P. Teaching Materials	___1. Demonstrates little variety in teaching materials which are effective	___2. Intermittently uses variety of teaching materials which are effective	___3. Regularly uses a variety of teaching materials which are effective	___4. Develops teaching materials to meet individual needs of students
Q. Student Involvement in Instruction	___1. Provides no opportunities for student involvement	___2. Provides occasional opportunities for student involvement	___3. Regularly involves students in instruction	___4. Involves students in all aspects of instruction (including planning)
R. Evaluation of Student Performance	___1. Seldom attempts to evaluate student performance	___2. Provides infrequent or inaccurate evaluation feedback to students	___3. Provides accurate feedback to students on a regular basis	___4. Recognizes improvements of students on all levels of performance
S. Instructional Effectiveness	___1. Seldom effective in accomplishing instructional objectives	___2. Intermittently effective in accomplishing instructional objectives	___3. Effective in accomplishing instructional objectives	___4. Effective in accomplishing instructional objectives even when confronted with unscheduled interruptions from others

Classroom Climate

T. Positive Affect	___1. Fails to recognize the need for a positive learning atmosphere	___2. Provides a positive learning atmosphere for some students	___3. Provides a positive atmosphere for most students	___4. Provides a comfortable learning atmosphere for all students
U. Behavior Management Plan	___1. Shows no evidance of behavior management plan for classroom	___2. Has behavior management plan that is difficult to enforce	___3. Has behavior management plan that can be enforced	___4. Has behavior management plan that meets needs of all students
V. Behavior Management	___1. Shows little or no classroom control	___2. Is inconsistent in controlling pupil behavior	___3. Consistently establishes and maintains effective discipline	___4. Plans and implements strategies for pupil self-discipline

Comments _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____ _____

Date Signature of Cooperating Teacher

Student Teacher Release Request

I request that this evaluation become a part of my Career Planning and Placement file.

_____

Signature of Student Teacher

I hereby grant permission to the College of Education, The University of Tennessee, to release the contents of this evaluation.

_____

Signature of Student Teacher

Revised: Used Fall 1989-Present

College of Education
The University of Tennessee

Name of Student Teacher _____ Name of Cooperating Teacher _____
Last First Middle Soc. Sec. No.

	Final Performance Level			
Personal				
A. Self Confidence	__1. No self confidence	__2. Self confidence varies	__3. Generally self confident	__4. Self confident in all situations
B. Critical Feedback	__1. Ignores or rejects criticism	__2. Accepts criticism, does not change behavior	__3. Accepts criticism, modifies behavior	__4. Solicits criticism, modifies behavior
C. Enthusiasm	__1. Little or no enthusiasm	__2. Sometimes enthusiastic	__3. Consistently enthusiastic	__4. Generates enthusiasm in others (students/peers)
D. Initiative	__1. Ignores requests for involvement	__2. Accepts requests for involvement, does only what was asked	__3. Accepts requests for involvement, does an outstanding job of what was asked	__4. Suggests involvement, does does an outstanding job
Professional				
E. Student Relationships	__1. Unresponsive to needs of students	__2. Intermittently sensitive to needs of students	__3. Demonstrates sensitivity to needs of students	__4. Willingly provides extra effort to meet students' needs
F. Peer Relationships	__1. Little or no interest in interacting with peers	__2. Intermittently shows interest in activities of peers	__3. Works well with peers	__4. Works hard to promote good working relationships with peers
G. Sense of Professional Responsibility	__1. Does not fulfill directed school responsibilities	__2. Needs to be reminded to meet directed school responsibilities	__3. Fulfills directed school responsibilities	__4. Is self motivated, assumes extra responsibilities willingly
H. Self-Evaluation	__1. Never evaluates performance or behavior	__2. Evaluates performance or behavior when requested to do so	__3. Initiates self evaluation	__4. Offers insightful suggestions after self-evaluation
I. Ethical Behavior	__1. Occasionally shows unethical behavior	__2. Must be reminded to be ethical	__3. Demonstrates ethical behavior	__4. Never demonstrates unethical behavior
J. School-related, Non-classroom Responsibilities	__1. Does not assume out-of-class responsibilities	__2. Intermittently assumes out-of-class responsibilities	__3. Performs out of class responsibilities for smooth operation of the school	__4. Is self motivated; assumes extra responsibilities willingly
Planning				
K. Preparation	__1. Does not prepare for classroom instruction	__2. Sometimes prepares for classroom instruction	__3. Consistently prepares for classroom instruction	__4. Displays evidence of superior preparation for instruction

Instruction

L. Subject Matter Preparation	___1. Does not know content	___2. Well prepared in some areas, inadequate in others (in content area)	___3. Broad subject matter preparation	___4. Expands student learning from that presented in textbooks
M. Communication with Student	___1. Frequently fails to communicate effectively with students	___2. Fails to communicate with some students	___3. Communicates effectively with students	___4. Always communicates effectively during instruction
N. Teaching Techniques	___1. Little or no evidence of variety in teaching strategies	___2. Intermittently uses variety of teaching strategies	___3. Uses a variety of teaching strategies which are effective in achieving objectives	___4. Develops exceptional teaching strategies to meet individual needs
O. Evaluation of Student Performance	___1. Seldom attempts to evaluate student performance	___2. Infrequent or inaccurate evaluation feedback provided students	___3. Students evaluated accurately on a regular basis	___4. Recognizes improvements of students on all levels of performance

Management

P. Management Plan	___1. No evidence of management plan for classroom	___2. Has management plan, occasionally fails to enforce	___3. Enforces management plan	___4. All students know management plan
Q. Classroom Management	___1. Little or no classroom control	___2. Is inconsistent in controlling pupil behavior	___3. Establishes and maintains effective discipline	___4. Plans and implements strategies for pupil self discipline
R. Classroom Organization	___1. Little or no skill in organizing the classroom learning environment	___2. Ineffectively manages the classroom learning environment	___3. Maintains a functional classroom learning environment; selects appropriate activities	___4. Assesses and adjusts the setting to provide for a variety of learning styles

Comments _____

_____

_____

_____
Signature of Cooperating Teacher

_____
Date

Student Teacher Release Request

I request that this evaluation become a part of my Career Planning and Placement file.

_____
Signature of Student Teacher

I hereby grant permission to the College of Education, The University of Tennessee, to release the contents of this evaluation.

_____
Signature of Student Teacher